



S. T. P E T E R

AT

R O M E :

BEING

AN HISTORICAL DISSERTATION,

BY

J. STEWART M'CORRY, D.D.

WITH AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING REFERENCE TO THE DISCUSSION HELD IN ROME, FEBRUARY 9TH
AND 10TH, 1872, IN THE HALL OF THE PONTIFICIA ACADEMIA
TIBERINA, BETWEEN THREE CATHOLIC PRIESTS AND
THREE EVANGELICAL MINISTERS, CONCERNING
THE COMING OF ST. PETER TO ROME.

LONDON : BURNS AND OATES,
17 & 18, PORTMAN STREET, AND 63, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1874.

Price Sixpence.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

	s.	d.	
TRANSUBSTANTIATION	1	0	1843
PURGATORY	1	6	—
FREE KIRK CATECHISM "ON POPERY."			1847
WAS ST. PETER EVER AT ROME?	1	0	1851
PANEGYRIC ON ST. PATRICK, delivered in Edinburgh			—
SUPREMACY of ST. PETER and the ROMAN PONTIFFS	2	6	1852
IRELAND: HER RELIGION AND LEARNING.			—
LETTERS on "A Plea for Christian Union."			—
JESUIT: Rise, Fall and Restoration of the Society of Jesus	1	6	1853
SOLICITOR-GENERAL for SCOTLAND on the BIBLE.			1854
LECTURE ON AUSTRIAN CONCORDAT.			—
KIRK: Answer to Eleven Ministers in Perth			1856
CALVINISM: Answer to Sixteen Ministers in Edinburgh			1857
PLEA FOR DECORATING GOD'S TEMPLE.			—
FOUR LECTURES, "DAWN of the REFORMATION"	1	6	1858
TRIALS and TRIUMPHS of the ROMAN PONTIFFS.			1860
LECTURE ON THE LIBERATOR OF IRELAND.			1861
TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.			—
FUNERAL DISCOURSE ON REV. DR. KEENAN.			1863
CHURCH AND HER TRIALS, delivered in Rome	0	6	1864
PIUS IX. AND NINETEENTH CENTURY			1865
INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL WORSHIP.			—
MOSAIC COVENANT and CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION	1	0	1866
ESSENCE OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP	1	6	1867
PAPACY: ST. PETER'S PONTIFICATE	1	0	—
MADONNA: ROME AND THE REVOLUTION	1	0	1868
CARDINAL BEATON, WISHART AND KNOX.			1869
REVIEW of MODERATOR'S ADDRESS, in General Assembly.			—
BISHOP of BRECHIN and ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.			—
PROTESTANT PRESS and VATICAN COUNCIL.			1870
MONKS OF IONA and DUKE OF ARGYLL	3	6	1871
TRUTH VINDICATED and DR. NORMAN MACLEOD			—
MEDIÆVAL HOLINESS: "DARK AGES"	1	6	1872
EDUCATION: CHURCH AND STATE	0	6	1873
LIMBO; AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD	0	6	—
THEOTOKOS; OR, THE DIVINE MATERNITY	0	6	—
WORLD and SECTS; or, Charge of Bishop of Bath and Wells	0	6	1874

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

THE following letters speak for themselves, and account for the unexpected republication of a *Brochure* which was first printed in 1851, and is now again committed to the press in this month of June, 1874. It is desirable, for the common weal, to be equal to the emergencies of the moment, to grapple with gratuitous assertions, and, without fail, to rebuke the wanton audacity of unblushing self-importance. The uncultured penny-a-liner must, forsooth, rush into print, and pronounce judgment on the most recondite subjects, while the unfledged scribe must chronicle his crude nostrums on Polemics and Politics, but, above all, upon Rome and the Roman States. May it be hoped that the republishing of the substance of an essay, written long years ago, which is now all but out of print, may contribute to dissipate the "darkness visible," still hovering over many minds; that it may stimulate to the investigation of other facts and queries; that it may lead to the discovery of that *Terra incognita* of which many are in quest, who, like the Athenians of old, were in search of the "unknown God;" that it may urge on philosophers of every school of thought, who cast the plummet of reason into an unfathomable ocean, to appreciate their short measurement, and to begin at length to pray, like the great scholar of Oriel, for light—

Lead, kindly light, amid the encircling gloom,
Lead thou me on!

"ST. PETER NON-ROMAN."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE UNIVERSE.

SIR,—In the leading columns of your last issue "St. Peter non-Roman" heads a *peculiar* letter from the Vicar of Clerkenwell. Its purpose is to repudiate the supposed admission that St. Peter ever lived in Rome, and accordingly the Vicar sends you his *peculiar* book for review as proof negative. Already have you dealt with it according to its deserts, and you may still have your rod *in pickle* for a second castigation. I should not, indeed, write this letter, but from the circumstance that my name figures in the ludicrous extract which you have taken from the pretentious volume. True it is that I am honoured by being associated with their Eminences—Bellarmino and Wiseman—yet am I bound to say that very questionable compliments with a profuse pen are lavished upon us all. The illustrious cardinals have passed away, but their immortal works live on and disdain contradiction. They are irrefragable as they are unanswerable; they are an oasis in the desert of an inflated nineteenth-century civilization; they stand up as pillars of light in the midst of darkness, and should illumine

even the murky atmosphere which broods over the Vicar and Vicarage of Clerkenwell. These great Churchmen were moral giants in their day, and self-important sciolists would be the object of their academic commiseration. As for myself, permit me to say that I should not feel honoured by condescending to notice the attack made from such a quarter on my disquisition, "Was St. Peter ever at Rome?" That tractate issued from the press during the *furor* of the so-called Papal Aggression, and is supposed to have done its meed of service to Holy Church, while it elicited the approval of the Church's highest dignitaries. It has survived sundry assaults, great and small, and received no vital wound; it has outlived the critical analysis, in which the anonymous author—"Truth about Rome"—wound up a treatise of some ninety pages with the climax of self-gratulation—"The foot of St. Peter was never pressed on the soil of Europe; he died, as he lived, the Apostle of the Circumcision!" It still stands entrenched in position, notwithstanding the doughty treatise, "St. Peter never at Rome," of which the present Lord Bishop of St. Davids wrote the following preposterous twaddle:—"The tradition of St. Peter's residence at Rome rests on no solid foundation!" The essay bids defiance to shallow-pated cavillers and one-sided historians; it has passed through more than one edition, and if the famed steam press of *The Universe* office be not overstocked with work, another edition may be forthcoming, without delay, bearing the title—"St. Peter at Rome," by

J. STEWART M'CORRY, D.D.

Clarence Gardens, Regents Park, June, 1874.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE UNIVERSE.

SIR,—In your issue of 13th June another letter appears from the Vicar of Clerkenwell, in which the names of their Eminences Bellarmine and Wiseman, as also my own, are again arrayed in reference to his publication, "St. Peter non-Roman." As I cannot stoop to offer any reply to such a quarter, I have consigned to your printers my historical dissertation, "St. Peter at Rome," upon which the public at large may pronounce their verdict. By way of securing greater accuracy in the treatment of so grave a question, his Grace the Archbishop of Westminster has been pleased to sanction the appointment, as *censor deputatus*, of the Rev. Father Bottalla, S.J., the eminent archæologist, who writes as follows:—

"12, Earl Street, Horseferry Road, Westminster,
"12th June, 1874.

"DEAR F. M'CORRY.—I have carefully read your pamphlet on 'St. Peter at Rome,' and I am glad to say that it contains all the main arguments which bear on the subject. They totally demolish the objections of the enemies of the Roman Primary and render full evidence to that historical fact, which makes Catholics regard the Roman chair as the centre of Catholic unity.

"I congratulate you, dear F. M'Corry, and feel confident that the new edition of your pamphlet will do great service to the Catholic cause in this country.

"Believe me, dear F. M'Corry, yours most sincerely,

"PAUL BOTTALLA, S.J."

—I have the honour to remain, your most obedient,

J. STEWART M'CORRY, D.D.

Clarence Gardens, Regents Park, June 15, 1874.

ST. PETER AT ROME.

SUBSTANCE OF LECTURES DELIVERED AT ST. JOHN'S CHURCH,
PERTH, 1851.

Having, on last Sunday evening, exposed the fallacies of the Rev. Dr. M'Michael's Lecture, "Romanism injurious to industrial energy, social improvement, and political freedom," which, on the previous Sunday, had been delivered in one of our city churches, under the auspices of United Presbyterianism, I come to treat another subject, which, from a combination of circumstances, has just now arrested a large amount of public attention. You well know the excitement which has been occasioned by the establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy in England; you know how grievously that act of the Supreme Pontiff has been misrepresented, as well as misunderstood; you know what means have been employed, by Durham letters and similar explosions, to fan the popular flame, by throwing obloquy upon the doctrines of the ancient Church of Christendom. Thanks to the kind Providence of Heaven, a calm has followed the storm, and the minds of our fellow-men are settling down to examine the *true state of the question*.

On several occasions have I addressed you on the nature of the Catholic Hierarchy: I have showed you that the constitution of the English Catholic Hierarchy was a *purely spiritual act*—an act which infringed no existing law—which interfered not with the rights of consciences of our fellow-citizens, and which was imperatively called for, on account of the vast increase of Catholicity in the sister kingdom.

The point to which I wish this evening to invite your attention, is one which is much agitated at the present moment. It is loudly declared by many of the adversaries of the Catholic Church, that St. Peter never was at Rome.

They thus *insidiously* labour to detract from the dignity of the Holy Roman Church, and, consequently, to deny that the supreme power of St. Peter over the Church of God on earth has descended by right of succession to the Roman Pontiffs.

It is unnecessary to advert to what is stated in the public journals upon this head, or to the controversies pending upon it, both in the metropolitan and provincial press. Suffice for our purpose to establish the point in dispute, and thereby to cut by the root all cavilling and misrepresentation. In truth, it is matter of surprise that a fact so well founded, which can be sustained by so many historical records, and which by the whole Catholic world has ever been unanimously upheld, should now become subject of contention. For I hesitate not to assert, that if in the entire range of ecclesiastical history, one point more than another can be lucidly demonstrated, it is pre-eminently the fact that St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, lived at Rome, and governed the Holy Roman Church, for a long series of years.

Remember, please, that my lecture this evening is to contain a dry statement of details—that I have to lead you over ground, not simply classical, but consecrated—that I have to point as we go along to the historical records extant, to the monumental trophies of bygone days, to the inscriptions in the ancient cemeteries, to the very walls adorned with portraits of the first Popes, and to the tomb which, according to all Christian and antiquarian tradition, contains the sacred remains of the Prince of the Apostles.

It is an Historical Fact which we have to prove; and that Fact, like every other Fact, must be proved by the weight of testimony. Now, the testimony which we can bring forward that St. Peter dwelt at Rome, presents an unbroken chain of evidence, reaching back from our own days to the apostolic times. No one who is not prepared to reject all human testimony, as well as all other facts recorded in ecclesiastical history, can possibly resist the force of the proofs which, from the very best sources, we are enabled to press into our service.

We shall first give a general outline of the question at issue, and afterwards examine the evidence on which it is grounded. The simple narrative speaks volumes.

After the ascension of Christ into heaven, Simon, the Prince of the Apostles, to whom our Lord had specially

given the name of Peter, having visited the various towns of Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, went to Antioch in Syria, about the year 36 of the Christian era, and there governed that See for some years. Having raised Evodius to the Episcopal dignity in Antioch, he went forth from Syria, and came to Rome in the year 42. There did he preach the Christian religion, and there also did he establish his Apostolic Chair. Some years afterwards he made a journey to Jerusalem, and presided at the council of the Apostles which had been convened in that city. From Jerusalem he undertook a journey through Asia Minor, and visited the churches of Pontus, Galacia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia. To these churches he afterwards addressed his epistle from Rome. The word "Babylon," used in that epistle, all the ancient fathers understand to be Rome, as we shall see in the sequel. This second journey to Rome was in the reign of Nero, and it is of this journey that Dionysius of Corinth and Lactantius write. There, about the kalends of June, in the year 67, did he suffer a most cruel death, under that impious tyrant. We may thus ascertain that the period of 25 years, assigned by Eusebius, St. Jerome, and other writers, to the Pontificate of St. Peter at Rome, is based on the best Historical records; for from the second year of Claudius, 42, in which St. Peter laid the foundations of the Holy Roman Church, to the year of his martyrdom, 67, there intervened five-and-twenty years. Certainly it is not assumed that he resided constantly in Rome during the whole of that time; but it is confidently asserted that he fixed in that ancient city his primatial See.

These facts are given by most of our writers on Church history—by Natalis Alexander; Fogginus, in his Treatise on St. Peter's coming to Rome, and Episcopacy; the Rev. Dr. Dollinger, in his History of the Church; and the Very Rev. Mgr. John Baptist Palma, formerly Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the College of Propaganda, under whom we studied, and to whose profound researches we feel deeply indebted, which also we have utilized.

With these preliminary observations, let us proceed with the testimonies which bear witness to the fact of St. Peter having lived and died at Rome. The testimonies to be adduced are from writers who lived in the Apostolic times, nay, who were eye-witnesses to what they recount. If their evidence is doubted, there is nothing either in Ancient or Modern History but what with equal justice may be called

in question. They wrote at a time when they had no end to serve, save the cause of truth. We know the unity of belief which prevailed among the Primitive Christians; that they were of "one mind and one heart;" that there were no divisions amongst them; and, consequently, that they had no object to induce them to give a mis-statement of facts. Hence the authority of the early writers is unexceptionable, and their veracity cannot justly be impeached.

The first witness that we shall bring forward is Clement the Roman, a disciple of St. Peter. After the persecution of Diocletian had subsided, he wrote an epistle to the Corinthians, in which he speaks of those who had *suffered martyrdom at Rome*, and makes distinct mention of *St. Peter* as the great Bishop who had founded and governed the Roman Church. He says:—*

"Let us always have before our eyes those good Apostles: Peter, who endured so many labours, and who, dying a martyr, departed to glory; and Paul, who obtained the reward of patience, and suffered martyrdom under the Emperors. . . . To these men, who led so angelic a life, a vast multitude of the elect were added, who, rivalling one another in suffering reproaches and torments, have left behind them for our sake the most beautiful example."

Now, here is a declaration from a Contemporary writer, bearing evidence to the fact that the Prince of the Apostles died a martyr at Rome. Tertullian assures us that Clement was ordained by St. Peter, and succeeded him in the Pontificate, after Linus and Anacletus, before the close of the first century. Surely such a testimony must speak volumes—must speak language which cannot be controverted.

Our second witness is Ignatius the martyr, who, according to St. Chrysostom, had succeeded Evodius in the See of Antioch, and who also, as St. Gregory tells us,† had been a disciple of St. Peter. When led to martyrdom, about the year 105, he wrote a letter to the Romans, entreating them not to prevent by their prayers the fulfilment of his desire to die for Christ. He begins thus:—

"Ignatius to the sanctified Church that *presides* in the country of the Romans. I do not command you, as Peter and Paul: they were apostles; I am an insignificant person."‡

Now, this proves that the Romans had been taught by St. Peter and St. Paul, and had received their "commands;" and, of course, shows that both Apostles had been at Rome.

* I refer to the letter itself: Ep. i. ad Cor. cap. v. apud. Colelerium: Patrum Apos,—† Lib. iv. Ep. 37.—‡ Epis. ad Rom. Colelerius, Tom. 11.

Our third witness is Papias, Bishop of Hieropolis, who had been a disciple of St. John, as Eusebius relates.* Papias tells us that Mark records in his gospel what he had heard from St. Peter at Rome, and he moreover tells us that St. Peter wrote his epistle from Rome, calling it by the mystic appellation of Babylon. The words of Papias are:—

“Which epistle of Peter was written at Rome, although he calls that city by the name Babylon, as we see from Eusebius.”

The fourth witness is Irenæus, a disciple of St. Polycarp, who had been at Rome. He says:—†

“As it would be very tedious to enumerate in this volume the successions of all the Churches, we shall confound our adversaries by referring to that Church which is the greatest, the most venerable and universally known—that Church, founded and established by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, which has preserved the traditions of the Apostles, announced the faith to men, and kept the succession of Bishops. . . . For with this Church, on account of its PRE-EMINENT PRINCIPALITY, it is necessary that every Church—that is, the faithful on all sides—should agree; in which the Apostolic tradition has always been preserved.”

Again, he adds:—

“St. Matthew wrote his gospel among the Jews in the Hebrew tongue: Peter and Paul preached at Rome, and founded the Church there.”

The fifth witness is Dionysius of Corinth, a writer of the second century, who says:—‡

“Peter and Paul having both come into our city of Corinth, and having instructed us in the doctrine of Christianity, went forth to Italy, and *instructed you also, Romans*, and suffered martyrdom at the same time.”

The sixth witness is Cajus, a venerable Roman priest, who lived towards the close of the second century, and whose words are peculiarly touching. He declares:—§

“I can point out to you the trophies of the Apostles Peter and Paul. For whether you direct your footsteps to the Vatican, or to the Ostian Way, the trophies of those who founded the Roman Church present themselves to your view.”

The seventh witness is Tertullian, also a writer in the second century. His testimony is exceedingly telling:—

“Come, then,” says he,|| “you who wish to exercise your curiosity to more advantage in the affair of salvation: pass in review the Apostolic Churches, in which the very chairs of the Apostles continue aloft in their places, in which their original letters are read, in which their voice is heard, and their countenance, as it were, seen. If you are near to Achaia, you

* Eusebius Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. cap. 15.—† Lib. iii. cap. 1 et iii. adv. Hæres.—‡ Euseb. Lib. ii. cap. 25.—§ Euseb. Lib. ii. cap. 15.—|| Lib. de præscrip. cap. 36.

have the Church of Corinth ; if you are not far distant from Macedonia, you have the Church of Philippi—of Thessalonica ; if you go forth into Asia, you have the Church of Ephesus ; if, however, you wend your way to Italy, you have the Church of Rome, whence authority is at hand for us likewise. ‘Ista quam felix Ecclesia!’—O Church peculiarly happy, into which the Apostles poured forth their whole doctrine with their blood ! where Peter was crucified, like his Divine Master ; and Paul, like the Baptist, was beheaded ; where John the Apostle, after having been thrown into a caldron of seething oil, came forth unhurt, and is banished to the island (Patmos).”

The eighth witness is Origen of Alexandria, who came to Rome during the pontificate of Zephyrinus. Thus does he speak of the Prince of the Apostles :—*

“Peter is thought to have preached to the Jews who were dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia ; he afterwards came to Rome, and was nailed to a cross, with his head towards the ground.”

The ninth witness is Optatus of Milevi. Arguing with a Donatist adversary, he says :—†

“You cannot deny but you know, that the chair of Peter *first of all* was fixed in the city of Rome, in which Peter, the *head* of all the Apostles, sat : whence, too, he was named Cephas : *in which single chair, unity was to be observed by all, so that the rest of the Apostles should not each maintain a chair to themselves ; and that forthwith he should be a schismatic and a sinner, who against that singular chair should set up another. Peter first sat in that chair, and was succeeded by Linus.*”

The tenth witness is Eusebius, who says :—‡

“During the reign of Claudius, . . . Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, came to Rome, by the Providence of God.”

Again he says in his Chronicon :—

“Peter the Apostle, by nation a Galilean, the first Christian Pontiff, having founded the Church at Antioch, came to Rome, where he preached the Gospel, and was Bishop of that city for 25 years.”

The eleventh witness is Paulus Orosius, who writes :—§

“Claudius, the Fourth (Emperor) from Augustus, having obtained the kingdom, governed 14 years ; at the beginning of his reign Peter, the Apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ, *came to Rome.*”

Our twelfth witness is St. Jerome, who, in his catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers, thus speaks :—

“Simon Peter, after having governed the Church at Antioch, came to Rome in the second year of Claudius. . . . He put to shame Simon Magus there, and governed the Roman Church for 25 years ; when in the 14th year of Nero he was crowned with martyrdom.”

* Euseb. Lib. iii. cap. 1. Hist. Eccles. et Lib. vi. cap. 14—† Lib. ii. cap. 3. contra Parmen.—‡ Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii.—§ Lib. vii. cap. 4.

In the same work he tells us :—

“His body was buried at Rome in the Vatican, near the Triumphal Way; and his feast is celebrated with the veneration of the whole city.”

Appropriately to this subject, we make remark that the illustrious Orator of Constantinople, St. John Chrysostom,* while discoursing on the Last Judgment, bursts out into a most eloquent apostrophe, alluding to St. Peter's Tomb at Rome—that the soul of the great Apostle on the last eventful day shall go forth to the shrine at Rome, to tenant his body anew!

We may, finally, refer to Arnobius, who distinctly tells us,† that St. Peter exposed the diabolical artifices of Simon Magus at Rome; to Hegesippus,‡ to Cyril of Jerusalem,§ to St. Ambrose,|| to St. Augustine,¶ and to many other writers of unexceptionable character. It would seem, however, an idle parade of research to bring forward additional testimonies from the ancient writers, whether from the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th centuries, corroborative of our position, as it would be altogether superfluous to indulge in any lengthened comments on those already adduced. The testimonies brought to bear are from writers who lived in the times when it is admitted on all hands that the Church was in her *greatest purity*. They speak for themselves in a way which *those who are sincere* in their inquiries after religious truth cannot possibly mistake: *those who are not sincere*, it would be hopeless to attempt to convince, much less to convert! The witnesses produced give telling evidence—evidence unanimous, concordant, conclusive—that St. Peter was at Rome; that he founded the Roman Church; that he was martyred at Rome. What more is wanted, in as far as this *vexata questio* is concerned? A *great public fact* is proved by *great public evidence*—is attested by those who were abundantly cognizant of all that they report. Sophistry may cavil, and infidelity may carp, but to attempt to throw overboard a fact, supported by such an array of unimpeachable authority, would be in the last degree adventurous. Those who try to do so must be prepared for the result, as their mode of proceeding would be the means of casting to the winds all authority in matters of history, both sacred and profane. On the selfsame principle that these testimonies, genuine as they are, should be called in question, we may call in question

* Hom. in Epis. ad Rom.—† Lib. ii.—‡ Lib. de excid Jeros.—§ S. Catech. vi.—|| Conc. de Bos. Hæret.—¶ Lib. de Hæres.

every other testimony, so that all confidence in history is utterly destroyed. It is easy to doubt, it is very easy to deny; we can doubt of every thing; and what can we not deny? Some there are who deny the existence of God, others deny the immortality of the soul; and there is a school of *so-called philosophers*, who have doubts about their own existence! If, in good sooth, unbelievers have doubted whether Jesus Christ ever existed, we may cease to wonder that there are some who deny that St. Peter was ever at Rome! Our adversaries in general, however, are not prepared to go to these extremes, or to follow out the legitimate workings of their own principles; therefore we must conclude, that when testimonies, the most authentic and irrefragable, are brought to bear on the point at issue, we must of necessity admit their full force, otherwise we may throw ourselves headlong into the gulf of an universal scepticism! For we aver, despite of contradiction, that no point in Greek or Roman history can be more fully demonstrated than the certain, notorious, universally-received fact that St. Peter was at Rome, and founded the Roman Church; therefore denial is as impertinent as it is audacious!

COUNCILS.

One word, now, with regard to the Councils, which also tell powerfully in favour of our position. Councils, in times of emergency, have ever been convoked by Apostolic authority, and have always been recognized as the most authoritative exponents of the belief and practice of the Christian Church. From the first General Council which was held in Nicæa, a town in Asia Minor, in the year 325, till the last General Council, held at Trent in 1545, the fathers assembled declared aloud, as it were with one voice, "That he who holds the See of Rome, being successor of St. Peter, is Head of the Church of God upon earth." Thus speaks the General Council of Constantinople, held in the year 381, when Macedonius, who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, was condemned. Thus speaks the General Council of Ephesus, held in 431, when Nestorius was condemned, who denied that Mary the Virgin was the Mother of God. Thus speaks the General Council of Chalcedon, held in 451, when Eutyches was condemned, who asserted that Christ had but one nature. And to omit, for the sake of brevity, the other General Councils, thus speaks the Holy Council of Trent, which had been summoned together by the same Apostolic

authority which has ever ruled the Church, when the novelties of the so-called Reformers were branded with condemnation. Rome, the See of Peter, the See of Pius IX., his successor, has ever been looked up to in matters of religion by the Christian world; the voice of Rome has ever been heard, and heard it is most distinctly in Great Britain and Ireland at the present hour by the establishment of the English Hierarchy and the constitution of the Irish Catholic University!

CATALOGUES.

Pass we now to another line of argument, which cannot fail to have its due weight. In truth, the sources from which we can draw proofs are so multifarious, that our principal difficulty is to classify and to condense. If, then, I may now say, we do not call in question the catalogue of our Scottish kings, or the names of the monarchs who swayed the sceptre in England, or in the other countries of Europe, neither can we dispute the catalogue of Roman Pontiffs, when furnished us by the most accredited writers. It has been well written by Macaulay, the brilliant Whig orator, but not always the reliable historian, that “the proudest royal houses of Europe are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of Roman Pontiffs. This line we trace back in an *unbroken series* from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century, to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eight, and far beyond the time of Pepin the august dynasty extends until its origin is lost in the twilight of fable.”

Now, it were almost a pity to destroy the charm of these fine flowing periods; but truth is ever inexorable, and handles polished writers and their laboured sentences sometimes rather roughly. I may, then, perhaps, be pardoned an observation if I say that it is *not the origin* of the Papal dynasty, but the ex-member for Edinburgh that is here lost *in twilight*! For what *twilight* can there be on a subject which is surrounded with a flood of light—which is made clear to us as noon-day by the most distinguished witnesses of the first ages? Assuredly there is no darkness here unless we shut our eyes to the light. However, we take Lord Macaulay’s admission as far as it goes. To prove now to our partizan historian, that the origin of the Papal dynasty is distinctly pointed out, I may refer to Irenæus,* to Tertulian,† to Eusebius,‡ to Optatus,§ and to many other ancient

* Lib. cont. Hæres. — † Lib. de Præscrip. — ‡ Hist. Eccles. — § Lib. cont. Parm.

writers, who have left behind in their works catalogues of the Popes, and have invariably mentioned St. Peter as having been the *first Pontiff* who governed the Church at Rome. Surely there is nothing savouring of fable here, since a *public fact* is evidenced by *public testimony*; and if that fact is denied, the other facts connected with the commencement of the Christian religion must share the same fate—they must stand or fall together, since the groundwork is identically the same.

Add to this, that the ancient Liberian Catalogue has ever been held in the greatest reverence by those distinguished in the literary world for their antiquarian researches. It is called the Catalogue of Liberius, because it was drawn up during the Pontificate of that Pope, about the year 354, and bears his name. The most learned men, such as Ægidius, Bucher, Petavius, Blanchini, Papebroke, Pearson, and others, respect this catalogue on account of its antiquity, and the genuine documents from which it was compiled. It thus begins: "During the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, our Lord Jesus Christ suffered death on the cross. . . . After His ascension, the Blessed Peter assumed the Pontificate, . . . and from that time is recorded the regular succession of Pontiffs."

This is confirmed by the chronology placed under the portraits of the Popes in the Ostian Basilica; which, according to ecclesiastical writers, were painted in the fifth century. St. Peter is, of course, the first in order. A portion of this magnificent structure, dedicated to St. Paul, was accidentally burned down; but the whole church has been restored to its former grandeur through the piety and munificence of the late Sovereign Pontiff, Gregory XVI.

Again, Marangonius, in his erudite work, "The Chronology of the Popes," gives us the long line of Pontiffs who governed the Roman Church, beginning with St. Peter.

Here we may be permitted, as bearing on our subject, to refer to an elaborate work, published 1874, entitled, "The Chronology of the Bible." It is from the pen of the erudite antiquarian, Ernest de Bunsen, and gives evidence of marvellous discriminating research. In pages 80-1-2, there is a most interesting chapter, headed, "St. Peter and Paul in Rome." At present we simply make this reference, but another reference we make also to our own volume, "The Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff," which was first published in the "Papal Aggression" days, 1852. In page 116 we stated, "It is worthy

of note that during the first thirteen hundred years of the Christian era no one ever thought of denying that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, or that he both lived and died in that city; and no one now calls this great fact in question, but who is either blinded by prejudice, or ignorant of Ecclesiastical History. In truth, the most learned Protestants, such as Grotius, Scaliger, Blondel, Shrock, Bertholt, Pearson, Basnage, Cave, and others, have been engaged in testing and establishing the point. Among others, we may mention the well-known name in the literary world, the distinguished Chevalier de Bunsen, of Prussia, now ambassador at the British Court, but whom we met at Rome, when ambassador at the Vatican. In a work of surpassing interest—"Rome, Sacred and Profane"—he, in conjunction with other erudite Germans, proves from the most authentic historical documents that the relics of St. Peter, which repose under the high altar of his Basilica, are really the veritable remains of that great Pontiff and Apostle."

Schelestratius, in his book, "The Antiquity of the Church;" Blanchini, in his notes to "The Lives of the Roman Pontiffs, written by Anastasius the Librarian;" Mamachius, in his volume "On Christian Antiquities;" Mabillon, Pagi, Henschenius, Muratori, Cardinal Garampi, and many others eminent in the world of letters furnish catalogues of the Roman Pontiffs, and St. Peter is ever mentioned as the first. *Now, if St. Peter was not the first Pope of Rome, will our adversaries please say who he was? If St. Peter did not found the Roman Church, by whom was it founded?* Tradition hands down no other—ecclesiastical history speaks of no other one as the first Pope—of no other one as the founder of the Roman Church is there mentioned save St. Paul, who was afterwards associated with St. Peter at Rome; yet St. Paul says in his Epistle to the Romans, that their faith had been spoken of throughout the world, though as yet he had not visited that city; therefore we are reduced to the dilemma, either of repudiating all tradition—of denying the other facts of Ecclesiastical History, or of admitting the well-attested fact that St. Peter was the first Pope, and founder of the Holy Roman Church. Are our adversaries prepared to accept this alternative?—of discarding all history, sacred and profane!

What, then, are we to say to the arguments deducible from the catalogues of the Roman Pontiffs furnished by the most accredited historians? Are we to cast them from us with disdain as of little or no importance? Then, by a parity of

reasoning, must we cast aside all the catalogues of our European kings. Or can we have the hardihood to assert that the historians in question deceived themselves, and conspired to deceive others? But what motive could they have? It is an axiom in philosophy: "*Nemo gratis fit malus*"—no one does evil without a reason. What reason, I ask, could these ancient writers have to deceive themselves or others who drew up the Catalogue of Roman Pontiffs hundreds of years ago?—who knew nothing of the modern religious jarrings now so prevalent in Great Britain; who were quite unacquainted with the merits of the famous Auchterarder and Gorham cases, which have rent in twain the religious establishments of Scotland and of England; who never dreamed that a system should be invented in modern times, when each man should be the architect of his own particular creed; who never could have conceived it possible that so many good pious souls amongst the British people should be committed to the *tender* mercies of so-called clergy, who have no right to teach—no authority to preach—no mission—no orders—no jurisdiction to administer sacraments! If, I say, we are not prepared to deny all history—to stigmatise all antiquity—to act at variance with the dictates of common sense, we must forthwith subscribe to the truth, which is here vouched for by the most disinterested, unexceptionable and concordant witnesses.

I have said that there are monuments at Rome which have survived the ravages of Goths and Vandals, and which speak to us in their own silent but eloquent language of the time in which St. Peter governed the Roman Church. Thus we find Cajus of old pointing to the trophies of Peter and Paul which ornament the Vatican and Ostian Road—we find Eusebius* pointing to the portraits of St. Peter and Paul who suffered martyrdom at Rome—we find Valesius describing the most ancient Christian monuments now existing in the Eternal City, on which the names of the Prince of the Apostles, and the Apostle of the Gentiles, are inscribed.

What more do we want?—what more can we require? Here are facts—*stern, stubborn, palpable* facts; and if these are denied, we may deny everything—we may deny, what no one can deny, without having eyes which see not and ears which hear not, and being in that state of wilful obduracy which it would be utterly hopeless to remove!

TO BE CONTINUED.

* Hist. Eccles. vii. c. 18.

